



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,670	09/09/2003	Nancy Tulgren	111516	2183

28020 7590 11/05/2007
GRAY, PLANT, MOOTY, MOOTY & BENNETT, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2906
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0906

EXAMINER

VALENTI, ANDREA M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3643

MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE

11/05/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,670	TULGREN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea M. Valenti	3643	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Andrea M. Valenti. (3) _____.

(2) Michael Bondi. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 10 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent 5,992,348; U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0100431; U.S. Patent No. 5,577,465.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued that one would not look to the teachings of Sherman to modify the teachings of Harding. Examiner maintains that it is a valid combination and sufficient motivation is taught by Sherman to combine. Also, in light of KSR it is the combination of a known element with a known device to produce predictable results. The applicant identified that the structural array claimed in claim 10 is a significantly unique structure over the prior art. The examiner indicated that if applicant would structurally claim how the array is formed as depicted in Fig. 1 that might help to distinguish. Merely claiming a plurality is just viewed as a duplication of the modified teachings of Harding and would not present a patentably distinct limitation. How the array is joined and configured together would be a better distinction. Applicant may want to consider picture claiming Fig. 1. Examiner indicated that the teachings of Cook are close in concept to applicant's array and that the Cook should be reviewed closely by applicant. Applicant proposed amending claims 10 and 13 and adding a new claim 16. The examiner indicated that it was the structural connection between the array that was significant and not merely that they were adjacent to each other..